

Miss Ashley regrets our restriction of the invalidity pension to those earning nothing instead of, as in Germany, to those earning less than one-third of their average wages, as likely to encourage malingering; and would prefer no maternity benefit for wives of insured men unless themselves insured. It is still too early to test the effect of Bismarck's legislation upon national health; but the compulsory system provides valuable information as to the course and causes of disease. The contributory principle is much commended, but Miss Ashley thinks the pauperisation argument is sometimes overdone. "Too much danger of misfortune in life is weakening rather than strengthening"—surely a sound reflection for the sterner type of eugenic politician.

A. W. COCKBURN.

Engel, DR. *The Elements of Child-Protection*. Translated by Dr. Eden Paul. London. Geo. Allen and Co.; 1912; price 15s.; pp. 276.

A VERY disappointing book. The first part consists of a sketchy enumeration of the various conditions that militate against the physical and moral well-being of the child. This is followed by a vague account of the various agencies which are at work for the benefit of the child. But Dr. Engel does not give us a single illuminating idea on the problems involved, and we have looked in vain for the data which, in his preface, he claims to have supplied us in order to enable us to form our own conclusions. He gives us simply page after page of statements without either the facts on which he bases them, or the reasons which have guided him in making them. These statements, he seems to think, are incontrovertible, and the great majority of them doubtless are, being mere platitudes, such as "Artificial feeding (of infants) frequently leads to illness, life-long debility, premature death, etc.," or "Alcoholism is a cause, both direct and indirect, of the maltreatment of children." But what will Eugenists say to "the parental constitution must be regarded as largely dependent upon the social environment in which the parents themselves have grown to maturity," or followers of Karl Pearson to the blind placing, as usual, of women's "*work for wages*" as one of the *chief* causes of infant mortality? Or what can anyone say to such statements, absolutely unsupported by either example or argument, as "Capitalism gives rise to numerous diseases in the social organism, and then endeavours to cure them, *for the most part, by the methods of child-protection*," and "Child-protection to-day is in essence *nothing more than a number of repressive measures*, which are necessary only because capitalism will not permit the desired ends to be obtained by the use of preventive methods, owing to the fact that prevention would involve the destruction of capitalism" (the italics are ours).

It is difficult to understand why this book was thought worthy of translation. It would be a very unsafe guide for those ignorant of the subject, and quite useless for anyone with any knowledge of it.

M. B. ANDREWS.

Saleeby, C. W., M.D., F.R.S.E. *Woman and Womanhood: A Search for Principles*. London. Heinemann; 1912; 10s. net; pp. 398.

WE disagree with Dr. Saleeby concerning many of the details of his book, but recognise that in it the true eugenic aspect of the woman's movement is clearly portrayed, and therefore recommend it for the consideration of all women who are taking part in the movement, and, above all, those who are responsible for its policy. There is very little to be said either for or against the woman's movement that has not been reiterated *ad nauseam*, but while nothing new is said, the facts are so grouped into their racial, social and economic settings as to throw fresh light on many points, and to conduce to clear thinking on some of the fundamental principles.

The author starts with the premise that "there is no antagonism between the claims of the future and the present, the race and the individual." We admire his optimism, but cannot altogether share it. The eugenic ideal must share the burden of any ideal of conduct, in demanding self-sacrifice from some of its followers, especially under present conditions when so many anti-eugenic social customs are in vogue, and the necessary re-adjustments have still to be made. The statement of the equality of but fundamental difference between men and women is perhaps largely recapitulation, but is so presented as to bring under critical examination many present customs—such as methods of education, ideals of development, problems of marriage and divorce, economic position, etc. The author insists on the need for bringing the educational ideal into accord with the requirements of racial well-being. He controverts Mr. Wells and Mr. Shaw's ideas on marriage and defends monogamy on biological principles, advocating at the same time an adjustment in marriage customs to meet the requirements of intellectually developed women. He emphasises strongly the danger to the race of any tendency which decreases the marriage rate among the more able women and thus deprives the future generation of its just inheritance.

The obvious reforms with reference to reducing the rate of infantile mortality, and equalising the numbers of men and women who emigrate, are advocated to assist in returning the selective function to the hands of women, but it may be some time before the numbers of men and women are again equal in Great Britain, though no one can doubt that the attainment of this end would solve many problems, both social and eugenic.

**Foerster, F. W.** *Marriage and the Sex Problem.* Translated from the German by Meyrick Boah, B.Sc. London. Wells, Gardner, Darton and Co., Ltd.; pp. 228.

THIS book is of very varied merits from the eugenic standpoint. On one point we are in entire agreement with the author, and that is in the recognition that all real improvement in human conduct, to be stable, must be based on worth of character and individual exercise of will, as he himself states, our aims are alike, although we differ as to the ways in which these aims may be realised. Perhaps partly owing to the policy of the "Bund für Mutterschutz" and similar German organisations, Dr. Foerster is rather apt to confuse the eugenic movement as a whole with the agitation for reforms in marriage and sexual relations which is now causing so much outcry in his country. It is probably owing to this confusion that he sees in eugenics an ideal antagonistic to religion. He takes up an attitude towards science and the growth of knowledge which apparently divorces science from religion, he therefore proceeds to depreciate the value of science and the need of understanding the laws of Nature. It seems difficult to understand the outlook of those who postulate a perfect Creator and then belittle all his creations! Surely, the laws governing the universe and, incidentally, the human species are the most wonderful expressions of the Divine mind, and as such should be reverently studied? Ever since the earliest tradition a knowledge of good and evil has brought with it the responsibility of exercising choice and judgment, why, therefore, should we be exempt from that responsibility when our limited understanding is capable of grasping some of the methods by which racial improvement may be attained? The Eugenist agrees that three things are required in the complete human being: good character, ability and health—all being interdependent.

In social progress some reforms in existing customs may be found necessary (we do not allow that many of those mentioned are either social or eugenic), but why should Dr. Foerster imagine that "There will be a practical dissolution of all authoritative truth . . . following